

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 19, 2005. Claims 1 to 6, 8, 10, 12 to 17, 19, 23, 25 and 27 to 30 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 19, 23 and 25 are independent.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 6 and 12 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Without conceding the correctness of the rejections, the claimed "second transmitting unit/step" has been amended to make it clearer that "an event condition indicating an event that is to be notified by the device", a feature which is clearly described in the specification and drawings. Thus, withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 17, 19, 20, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,872,569 (Salgado) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,711 (Sekizawa). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns displaying a device and event notification information on a map for displaying a location of the device. According to one aspect of the invention, an event condition indicating an event to be notified by the device is transmitted by an information processing apparatus to the device. The device, at the occurrence of the event corresponding to the event condition, transmits event notification information, whereby information indicating the device and the event notification information is displayed on a map. As a result, a user can be notified of particular events, for example, when a job is completed, as well as the location of the device that completed the job merely by referring to the displayed map.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is an information processing apparatus, comprising a first transmitting unit adapted to transmit a job to a device connected to the information processing apparatus through a network, a second transmitting unit adapted to transmit to the device an event condition indicating an event that is to be notified by the device to the information processing apparatus, a receiving unit adapted to receive from the device event notification information of the event corresponding to the event condition transmitted by the second transmitting unit, and a display unit adapted to display information indicating the device and the received event notification information on a map for displaying a location of the device.

Amended independent Claims 12 and 23 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Amended Claim 8 is directed to the device side and therefore is a device for processing a job requested from an information processing apparatus via a network, comprising a storing unit adapted to store display location information on a map for displaying a location of the device, a receiving unit adapted to receive from the information processing apparatus an event condition indicating an event that is to be notified to the information processing apparatus, and a transmission unit adapted to transmit event notification information corresponding to the event condition received by the receiving unit and the display location information to the information processing apparatus according to an occurrence of the event.

Amended Claims 19 and 25 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 8.

Amended independent Claim 10 is a system claims that substantially includes the features of Claims 1 and 8.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of transmitting to a device (receiving by the device) an event condition indicating an event that is to be notified by the device to an information processing apparatus, receiving event notification information (transmitting event notification information at the occurrence of the event) of the event corresponding to the event condition, and displaying information indicating the device and the received event notification information on a map for displaying a location of the device.

The Office Action admits that Salgado fails to disclose receiving event notification information of an event from the device. Assuming this to be true, Salgado can not possibly display the event notification information on a display, nor would it be possible for the device to transmit event notification information to the information processing apparatus at the occurrence of an event corresponding to an event condition indicating an event to be notified.

Applicants also wish to point out that the Office Action's reliance on Salgado teaching "the printer (device) transmits status information w.r.t. the processed job to the user (col. 21, lines 53-65, col. 26, lines 20-62)" as allegedly corresponding to the claimed "second transmitting unit ..." is wholly misplaced. Specifically, the second transmitting unit of Claim 1 is contained within the information processing apparatus such that the event notification information is transmitted by the information processing apparatus *to the device*. The Office Action's assertion is completely opposite the claimed feature since, as readily admitted in the Office Action, *the device* is doing the transmitting of status information. Thus, basis for the rejection is itself fatally flawed.

Turning now to Sekizawa, it is merely seen to disclose that an agent device acquires the status indicating the state of a printer from a network printer. For example, information such as "NO PAPER", "TONER OUT", etc. is acquired from the printer. Thus, Sekizawa operates opposite that of the present invention in that the status information of a printer is acquired from the printer rather than being transmitted by the printer in response to the occurrence of an event corresponding to an event condition received by the printer from the information processing apparatus. Thus, Sekizawa is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Salgado, would have resulted in the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of independent Claims 1, 8 to 12, 19, 20, 23 and 25, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

As a formal matter, Applicants make a third request that the Examiner provide an indication in the next communication acknowledging Applicants' claim to priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, dated February 16, 2001, together with an acknowledgment of receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents filed concurrently therewith.

Applicants also make a second request that the Examiner return an initialed Form PTO-1449 from the June 28, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement with the next communication.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 100732v1